Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1. The Figure is amended to change reference character 112 to 122 to be consistent with the specification.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed June 29, 2005 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1, 4, 12, and 16 have been amended and claims 21-26 are added. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 12, and 16 being the only independent claim. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

The drawings are amended to correct an error in the drawings noted by Applicant's representative during review of the application for purposes of drafting this amendment. Reference character 112 in Fig. 1 is changed to 122 to be consistent with the specification.

Claim 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the Examiner alleges that the phrase "receiving from the endpoint device a request signal for assignment of a network address to the endpoint device" is unclear. The Examiner states that it is unclear how the endpoint device is transmitting to itself. Claim 4 is amended to clarify that the endpoint is requesting that a network address be assigned to the endpoint. In view of the amendments, claim 4 is now definite and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph should now be withdrawn.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,012,088 (Li).

Independent claim 1 is amended to clarify that there are a plurality of classes of endpoint devices and now recites "the endpoint device being in one of a plurality of classes of endpoint devices" and "identifying, through said established connection, a class of the endpoint device connected to the network from said plurality of classes of endpoint devices".

Li fails to teach or suggest the step of "identifying, through said established connection, a class of the endpoint device connected to the network from said plurality of classes of endpoint devices" because Li teaches configuring only one type of device, i.e., the Internet access device to which end devices are connected.

Li discloses a method for automatically configuring an Internet access device. The Internet access device is a device which facilitates communication between end users and the Internet (see col. 6, lines 34-37 of Li). According to the method of Li, a customer first contacts an Internet service provider (ISP) and informs the ISP of the specific needs for connection to the Internet (col. 9, lines 26-49). The ISP then inputs the information into an ISP database and generates a configuration file which is stored in a configuration server (col. 9, lines 50-57 and col. 10, lines 6-8). Once the ISP has determined an IP address for the configuration server that holds the configuration file, the ISP generates a registration identification number for the customer (col. 10, lines 19-22). Once the registration number is generated, the ISP then ships the Internet access device to the customer, along with the registration ID and a number for accessing the ISP (col. 10, line 66 - col. 11, line 1). Once a customer receives the Internet access device, the registration ID and the access number, the customer connects the Internet access device and inputs the registration ID and the access number (col. 11, lines 45-58). The Internet access device connects to the ISP with a minimum of configuration (col. 11, lines 63-65). The registration ID is used in an automatic configuration process which configures the Internet access device for communication at the customer's desired level of service (col. 12, lines 13-17).

Li discloses that only Internet access devices are automatically configured. Therefore, Li discloses that only one class or type of devices is automatically configured. Since the Li discloses only one type of device that can be configured, Li fails to disclose the step of

identifying the class of the device to be configured. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Li under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Furthermore, since the device of Li is always an Internet access device, there is no motivation or suggestion for including the step of identifying the class of the device to be auto configured, as expressly recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is allowable over Li under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner addresses the recited step of "identifying a class" by stating that it is inherent for an address to have a class. However, the Examiner's rejection does not address that the device may be one of a plurality of classes.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable over Li.

Independent claims 12 and 16 are amended to include limitation similar to those of independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claims 12 and 16 are not anticipated by and are not unpatentable over Li for the same reasons as independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 2, 14, and 17 each recite that a second unique network address is "selected from a block of predetermined network addresses for the identified class of the endpoint device". As stated above, Li does not have to identify a class of the device being configured because it is always an Internet access device. Accordingly, there is no reason to assign a second unique network address based on an identified class of the endpoint or to have a block of predetermined network addresses for the identified class of the endpoint device, as recited in dependent claims 2, 14, and 17. Therefore, dependent claims 2, 14, and 17 are each allowable for these additional reasons.

New claims 21-23 are added to identify specific classes of components. Support for this limitation is found at page 7, lines 16-17, of the original specification. Since Li discloses only one type of component, i.e., an Internet access component, Li fails to teach or suggest identifying any of the listed types of devices. Dependent claims 21-23 should be allowable for these additional reasons.

New claims 24-26 recited that the classes of end devices are different types of components. Support for this limitation is found at page 7, lines 15-17, of the original specification. Since Li discloses only one type of component, i.e., an Internet access component, Li fails to teach or suggest identifying a type of component, as recited in new dependent claims 24-26. Accordingly, dependent claims 24-26 should be allowable for these additional reasons.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By 

Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: October 31, 2005